

**REMARKS**

Applicant notes with appreciation the detail attention accorded the present Application by the Examiner in the Office Action mail August 11, 2005. In that Action, Claims 1-7 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent 5,653,534). Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable for alleged obviousness over Matsumoto in view of Azari (U.S. Patent 5,268,050). Claims 10 and 12 were objected to as they depend from a rejected base claim, but were acknowledged to recite allowable subject matter. In response, independent claims 1 and 11 are amended, and the subject matter noted to be allowable in claims 10 and 12 has been rewritten in independent form as new claims 13 and 14, respectively. Dependent claim 3 has also been amended for clarification. Claim 1, 3, and 11 having been amended, and new claims 13 and 14 having been added, the claims now pending are claims 1-14. Favorable consideration is requested for the following reasons.

**35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejections**

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to distinguish over the Matsumoto reference. Matsumoto discloses a method where the reinforcing fibers are cut into multiple fibers in "a scattered state." (Column 8, lines 50-52) prior to being introduced to the molten resin. In the Applicant's invention, a continuous fiber strand is introduced with the molten resin. Therefore, Claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by Matsumoto. Additionally, Claims 2-7, depending on Claim 1, are now in condition for allowance since the amended Claim 1 is not anticipated by prior art.

Additionally, Claim 11, as amended, is not anticipated by Matsumoto since Matsumoto does not teach introducing a continuous fiber strand to the molten resin as discussed in the paragraph above.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections**

The Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected as obvious over Matsumoto in view of Azari. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as dependent claims of an allowable independent claim, Claim 1. Furthermore, Azari is not combinable with Matsumoto because Azari relates to the production of fiber reinforced thermal pellets, tapes and similar products having a high fiber concentration, by way of pultrusion ( see Column 1, Lines 9-17; Column 5, Lines 21-23) whereas Matsumoto et al. disclose extrusion followed by a gravitational feed to rollers 420 (see column 8, 20-27) to form sheets. Matsumoto does not utilize pultrusion in its invention. The invention in Matsumoto takes the ring-shaped molten resin and slightly presses it together with a pair of rollers (Column 8, Lines 23-24) before it is fed into the screw unit. There is no pulling or pultrusion of the ring-shaped molten resin. Furthermore, Matsumoto does not contain a suggestion or motivation to utilize its invention with pultrusion processes. Additionally, the processes of Matsumoto and Azari are fundamentally different since Matsumoto cuts the fibers before sandwiching the fibers with sheets of resin, whereas Azari introduces fibers to molten resin flowing in an opposition direction. Therefore, it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings in Matsumoto with the teachings in Azari.

### **Objections**

Original Claims 10 and 12 have been rewritten in independent form as Claims 13 and 14, respectively, as suggested by the Examiner to put them in condition for allowance.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the pending claims and the arguments presented herein successfully overcome the Examiner's objections and rejections to the Claims. Insofar as the rejections and objections may be maintained with respect to any of present claims, reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested, as is the allowance of the claims.

Applicant believes that all of the pending claims should now be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Enclosed herewith is a Petition for a three-month extension of time, extending the end of the period for responding to the outstanding office action from November 11, 2005 to February 11, 2006. Please charge the fee for the three-month extension of time to the undersigned attorney's Deposit Account No. 13-4300. If any further fees are required to make the present response timely, the office is hereby authorized to charge them to the deposit account of the undersigned attorney's law firm, Deposit account.

Thank you.

The Examiner is respectfully urged to contact the undersigned attorney if there are any further matters standing in the way of allowance of the above-identified application and it is believed by the Examiner that these matters can be addressed and resolved in a telephone conference and thereby speed the conclusion of the present prosecution. The Examiner's consideration in this regard will be appreciated.


**Customer No. 22854**

Respectfully submitted,

For the Applicant,  
By his Attorneys

MOORE, HANSEN & SUMNER  
225 South Sixth Street  
Suite 4850  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Tel. 612-332-8200

Date: February 10, 2006

By   
Robert C. Freed, Registration No. 32,569